

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

BARRON LAZZIRA GARNETT,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 06-C-1257

MILWAUKEE COUNTY JAIL, SERGEANT
JAMES CRISS, and JAN BRYLOW,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Barron Lazzira Garnett, who is proceeding *pro se*, lodged a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. This matter comes before the court on the plaintiff's petition to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The plaintiff is required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$350.00 for this action. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). If a prisoner does not have the money to pay the filing fee, he can request leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. To proceed with an action *in forma pauperis*, the prisoner must complete a petition and affidavit to proceed *in forma pauperis* and return it to the court with a certified copy of the prisoner's trust account statement showing transactions for the prior six months. The court then assesses and, when funds exist, collects from the plaintiff at the time the action is filed an initial partial filing fee of 20% of

the average monthly deposits to or the average monthly balance in the prisoner's trust account for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint.

In this case, the plaintiff has filed a certified copy of his prison trust account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of his complaint. The prisoner has been assessed and paid an initial partial filing fee of \$18.57.

The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Hutchinson ex rel. Baker v. Spink*, 126 F.3d 895, 900 (7th Cir. 1997). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. "Malicious," although sometimes treated as a synonym for "frivolous," "is more usefully construed as intended to harass." *Lindell v. McCallum*, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109-10 (7th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

A complaint, or portion thereof, should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of the claim or claims that would entitle him to relief. *See Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984) (citing *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)). In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the court must accept as true the allegations of the complaint in question, *Hosp. Bldg. Co. v. Trs. of Rex Hosp.*, 425 U.S. 738, 740 (1976), construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, and resolve all doubts in the plaintiff's favor. *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969).

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, plaintiffs must allege: 1) that they were deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and 2) that the deprivation was visited upon them by a person acting under color of state law. *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). The court is obliged to give the plaintiff's *pro se* allegations, however inartfully pleaded, a liberal construction. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) provides that a complaint must include only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” This statement must simply “give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002) (quoting *Conley*, 355 U.S. at 47); *see also Thomson v. Washington*, 362 F.3d 969, 970-71 (7th Cir. 2004) (no heightened pleading requirement for *pro se* prisoner civil rights

complaint). Of course, if a complaint pleads facts that show that a plaintiff does not have a claim, the complaint should be dismissed “without further ado.” *Thomson*, 362 F.3d at 970.

The plaintiff is detained at the Milwaukee County Jail. The defendants in this case are the Milwaukee County Jail, Program Manager Jan Brylow, and Sergeant James Criss. The plaintiff claims that the defendants violated his constitutional right to vote.

The plaintiff alleges that on November 6, 2006, defendant Criss announced that qualified inmates, meaning those who were not on probation or parole, could fill out an inmate request form if they wanted to vote. The plaintiff filled out the form. On the day of voting, the plaintiff inquired as to exercising his right to vote and he was told that someone would come and get him to go and vote. However, no one came and the plaintiff did not vote. He seeks compensatory and punitive damages, and injunctive relief.

The right to vote is one of those rights that “is preservative of other basic civil and political rights.” *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 562 (1964). Unsentenced inmates otherwise under no disability to vote may not be denied the franchise, although the state need not provide them with the most expeditious means of voting possible. *See McDonald v. Bd. of Election Comm’rs.*, 394 U.S. 802, 807-809 (1969). In *O’Brien v. Skinner*, 414 U.S. 524, 530 (1974), the Court found unconstitutional New York statutes that were construed by that state’s highest court as denying to persons detained in counties of their residence absentee registration or voting, while granting these rights to persons similarly detained outside counties of their residence. The Court held that the statutes were “wholly arbitrary” and

violated equal protection and went on to say that the state cannot deny voters “any alternative means of casting their vote although they are legally qualified to vote.” *Id.*

The court finds that the plaintiff has alleged sufficient facts to support a claim that his constitutional rights were violated based on the denial of his right to vote. However, the Milwaukee County Jail is not a "person" for purposes of federal civil rights statutes. *See Powell v. Cook County Jail*, 814 F.Supp. 757, 758 (N.D. Ill. 1993). The jail is therefore not a suable entity under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and it will be dismissed.

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

The plaintiff has filed a motion to appoint counsel. Indigent civil litigants have no absolute constitutional or statutory right to be represented by counsel in federal court. *Jackson v. County of McLean*, 953 F.2d 1070, 1071 (7th Cir. 1992); *McKeever v. Israel*, 689 F.2d 1315, 1318 (7th Cir. 1982). This court is authorized to request, but not to compel (*see Mallard v. United States District Court*, 490 U.S. 296 (1989)), an attorney to represent an indigent civil litigant pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). *Jackson*, 953 F.2d at 1071; *McKeever*, 689 F.2d at 1318. However, this court has no access to funds to compensate attorneys for such representation. This court, therefore, appoints counsel under § 1915(e)(1) only in the rare case where the failure to appoint counsel would be so fundamentally unfair that the plaintiff's due process rights would be violated. *McNeil v. Lowney*, 831 F.2d 1368, 1371 (7th Cir. 1987).

The threshold requirement for appointment of counsel under § 1915(e)(1) is whether a plaintiff has made a reasonable, but unsuccessful, effort to retain counsel, or whether the plaintiff was effectively precluded from making such efforts. *Jackson*, 953 F.2d at 1073. If a plaintiff has made no effort to secure counsel, the motion must ordinarily be denied outright. *Id.* Once this initial requirement is met, the court, in exercising its discretion with regard to plaintiff's request, must address the following question: given the difficulty of the case, does this plaintiff appear to be competent to try the case himself and, if not, would the presence of counsel likely make a difference in the outcome of the case. *See Farmer v. Haas*, 990 F.2d 319, 322 (7th Cir. 1993).

In this case, the plaintiff has not provided any indication that he has unsuccessfully attempted to obtain legal counsel on his own. The plaintiff should provide the court with the names and addresses of five attorneys he has contacted. Moreover, the issues in this case appear at this stage to be straightforward and uncomplicated. Accordingly, the plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel will be denied.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Docket #2) be and hereby is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Docket #3) be and hereby is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant Milwaukee County Jail is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Marshal shall serve a copy of the complaint, the summons, and this order upon the defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that the defendants shall file a responsive pleading to the complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Milwaukee County Sheriff or his designee shall collect from the plaintiff's prison trust account the \$331.43 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from the plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED that copies of this order be sent to the warden of the institution where the inmate is confined and to Corey F. Finkelmeyer, Assistant Attorney General, Wisconsin Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7857, Madison, Wisconsin, 53707-7857.

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he is required to send a copy of every paper or document filed with the court to the opposing parties or their attorney(s). Fed. R. Civ. P.

5(a). Plaintiff should also retain a personal copy of each document. If plaintiff does not have access to a photocopy machine, plaintiff may send out identical handwritten or typed copies of any documents. The court may disregard any papers or documents which do not indicate that a copy has been sent to each defendant or to their attorney(s).

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.

In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk's Office of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 16th day of April, 2007.

SO ORDERED,

s/ Rudolph T. Randa

HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
Chief Judge